

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

GEORGE RAHSAAN BROOKS-BEY,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:11-CV-307
Plaintiff	:	
	:	(Judge Conner)
v.	:	
	:	
C.O. SCHMERFELT, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 13th day of April, 2011, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Blewitt (Doc. 9), recommending that plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and, following an independent review of the record and noting that plaintiff filed objections¹ to the report on March 29, 2011 (Doc. 10), and the court finding Judge Blewitt's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding plaintiff's objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Blewitt's report, it is hereby ORDERED that:

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge (Doc. 9) are ADOPTED.
2. Plaintiff's complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge